



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

N.K.
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/617,868	07/17/2000	Thomas J. Shaw	75329 77432	8293

7590 01/29/2003

Monty L Ross Esq
LOCKE LIDDELL & SAPP LLP
2200 Ross Avenue
Suite 2200
Dallas, TX 75201-6776

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

SIRMONS, KEVIN C

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3763

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/617,868	SHAW, THOMAS J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kevin C. Sirmons	3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 29-34, 36-42, 44-50, 52-94 and 96 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 29-34, 36-42, 44-50, 52-94 and 96 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of the withdrawal of claim 95 in Paper No. 10 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the combination / subcombination is improper because claim 95 and the invention as originally claimed fall within the same art. This is not found persuasive because (see MPEP 806.05 (C) and I. Subcombination not Essential to Combination).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 29-34, 36-42, 44-50, 52-94 and 96 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of Shaw U.S. Patent No. 5,385,551. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present application broadly recites similar

structural elements such as: a hollow body, retaining member, plunger, retraction mechanism, needle, biasing element, etc. which can all be found in the above mentioned patent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Caselli U.S. Pat. No. 5,201,710.

Caselli discloses a syringe assembly having a retractable needle and a front end portion with an elongate biasing element and a one-piece needle holder, the needle holder having a back portion (the examiner considers the cone portion of (14) of Fig. 5) and/or the flat outer surface of the distal portion of (14) of fig. 3) to be the back portion) and a front portion (13), the back portion having a flat, blunt surface that forms at least part of a variable fluid chamber in a barrel (figs. 3 and 5), the front portion extending through the biasing element and protruding forwardly beyond all other structural elements of the assembly except the needle (figs. 1-5).

Response to Arguments


Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3763

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Kevin C. Sirmons whose telephone number is (703) 306-5410. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 am to 4:00 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.


Kevin C. Sirmons
Patent Examiner
1/23/03


BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700